UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,726	03/21/2006	Masahiko Iizumi	NS-US065336	6887
	7590 09/30/200 OUNSELORS, LLP		EXAMINER	
1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680			MCMAHON, MARGUERITE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3747	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summers	10/572,726	IIZUMI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Marguerite J. McMahon	3747					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	-· action is non-final.						
<i>,</i>		secution as to the merits is					
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	in parte quayre, 1000 G.D. 11, 10	0 0.0. 210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	·						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No In this National Stage					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te					

Art Unit: 3747

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, drawn to a surface roughening method comprising moving a cutting tool to create a first machined pattern of peaks and valleys on a surface of the article and a second machined pattern to form roughened fracture surfaces in a second machined pattern on the surface of the article, wherein the second machined pattern comprises an arrangement of grooves corresponding to the valleys in the first pattern and separated by lands corresponding to roughed fracture surfaces, classified in class 451, subclass 177+.
- II. Claim 15, drawn to a surface roughening system comprising a means for roughening a surface comprising first and second cutting edge means, means for moving the means in an axial direction, means for rotating the means in a radial direction, wherein rotating the means for roughening while feeding the means for roughening relative to the surface creates a roughened surface, classified in class 451, subclass 177+.
- III. Claims 16-26, drawn to a cutting tool comprising a rotary cutting head comprising a body having at least one cutting blade extending radially outward therefrom, wherein the cutting blade comprises a body, a first planar surface and a second planar surface, wherein the first planar

Art Unit: 3747

surface of the cutting blade extends a first radial distance from a center of the body of the head and the second planar surface extends a second radial distance from the center of the head and wherein the first distance is greater than the second distance, classified in class 451, subclass 177+.

IV. Claims 26-41, drawn to a cylindrical body having a machine roughened surface, wherein the roughened surface comprises a substantially helical pattern of grooves separated by lands corresponding to substantially uniform roughed surface regions wherein the cross section of the grooves is substantially symmetrical and each groove has a v-shape, classified in class 123, subclass 193.2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as a surface roughening method comprising moving a cutting tool to create a first machined pattern of peaks and valleys on a surface of the article and a second machined pattern to form roughened fracture surfaces in a second machined pattern on the surface of the article, wherein the second machined pattern comprises an arrangement of grooves corresponding to the valleys in the first pattern and separated by lands corresponding to roughed fracture surfaces; subcombination II has separate

Art Unit: 3747

utility such as a surface roughening system comprising a means for roughening a surface comprising first and second cutting edge means, means for moving the means in an axial direction, means for rotating the means in a radial direction, wherein rotating the means for roughening while feeding the means for roughening relative to the surface creates a roughened surface; and subcombination III has separate utility as a cutting tool comprising a rotary cutting head comprising a body having at least one cutting blade extending radially outward therefrom, wherein the cutting blade comprises a body, a first planar surface and a second planar surface, wherein the first planar surface of the cutting blade extends a first radial distance from a center of the body of the head and the second planar surface extends a second radial distance from the center of the head and wherein the first distance is greater than the second distance; See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Art Unit: 3747

Inventions I, II and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as by employing a conventional cutting tool and a separate honing device.

Inventions III and IV are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case the apparatus is not an obvious apparatus for making the produce and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product, since the product made could be made by another and materially different apparatus such as a conventional cutter and a separate honing device.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

Art Unit: 3747

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to

Application/Control Number: 10/572,726

Art Unit: 3747

be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 8

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marguerite J. McMahon whose telephone number is 571-272-4848. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Wednesday and Friday, 10am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Cronin can be reached on 571-272-4536. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3747

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marguerite McMahon Primary Examiner Art Unit 3747

/Marguerite McMahon/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3747